UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/675,982	09/29/2000	Seth Bradley Noble	004098.P001	1722

7590 07/27/2007

Robert B O'Rourke
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER	
LAZARO, DAVID R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/675,982	NOBLE, SETH BRADLEY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Lazaro	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 May 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14,16-19,21-27 and 46-59* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14,16-19,21-27 and 46-59* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *5/7/07, 5/4/07*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed 05/04/07.

2. Claims 1, 16 and 46 were amended.

3. Claims 15, 20, 28-45 are canceled.

4. Claims 1-14, 16-19, 21-27 and 46-59 are pending in this office action.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The IDS submitted 05/07/2007 and 05/04/07 have been considered by the examiner.

Response to Amendment

6. Applicant's arguments filed 05/04/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See Response to Arguments. The grounds of rejection presented in the 12/28/2006 office action are respectfully maintained.

Claim Objections

7. Claim 1 objected to because of the following informalities: The "d)" label in the claim appears to have been unintentionally left in. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 1, 16 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

10. Each of claims 1, 16 and 46 contain the limitation "*performing the following at said client without regulating traffic flow by an underlying transport layer at said client*". However, this seems to be in contradiction to the specification. Page 12 of the specification specifically states "*A transport layer, such as client transport layer 307 and server transport layer 310, is a networking layer located on each of a pair of network nodes which is* ***responsible for controlling the flow of information between applications located on each node***." (emphasis added). Clearly, the client in applicant's invention regulates traffic flow (controlling the flow of information) between applications through the use of an underlying transport layer. The specification does not disclose an embodiment that does not include/use the described transport layer. As such, the subject matter, "*performing the following at said client without regulating traffic flow by an underlying transport layer at said client*", is not sufficiently described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that

the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 1, 16 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

13. Each of claims 1, 16 and 46 contain the limitation "*performing the following at said client without regulating traffic flow by an underlying transport layer at said client*". However, this seems to be in contradiction to the specification. Page 12 of the specification specifically states "*A transport layer, such as client transport layer 307 and server transport layer 310, is a networking layer located on each of a pair of network nodes which is* ***responsible for controlling the flow of information between applications located on each node***." (emphasis added). Clearly, the client in applicant's invention regulates traffic flow (controlling the flow of information) between applications through the use of an underlying transport layer. It is not clear as to how the client in applicant's invention can operate "without regulating traffic flow by an underlying transport layer". For these reasons, claims 1, 16 and 46 fail to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

15. Claims 1-4, 13, 14, 46-49 and 58 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,061,733 by Bodin et al. (Bodin).

16. With respect to Claims 1 and 46, Bodin teaches a method (and corresponding machine readable medium), comprising:

generating, at a client, a request for an action to be performed by a server to a data object, said data object being maintained by said server, said server to, generate a response for said client as a consequence of performing said action (Col. 2 line 65 - Col. 3 line 4: user selects a file to be downloaded from a server); and

performing the following at said client without regulating traffic flow by an underlying transport layer at said client (Bodin does not indicate an underlying transport layer in the following citations):

sending a request message from said client to said server over a network, said response being divide-able into a plurality of smaller response portions (Col. 3 lines 5-19: file to be downloaded is divided into a plurality of smaller portions), wherein said request message comprises a request for a first response portion of said plurality of

smaller response portions and wherein said request message (Col. 3 lines 38-51: user can select a portion to request for download) further comprises:

1) a description of said action (Col. 3 line 38-51 and Col. 3 line 63-Col. 4 line 11 - server recognizes the request is for downloading a portion of a particular file);

2) a description of said data object (Col. 3 line 38-51 and Col. 3 line 63-Col. 4 line 11: portion name related to the file to be downloaded);

3) a first limit that defines the maximum size of said first response portion (Col. 3 line 38-51 and Col. 3 line 63-Col. 4 line 11: portion size);

maintaining at said client an understanding of how much of said first response portion has been sent by said server and received from said network by said client (Col. 4 lines 39-46: client is aware of whether a request portion has been downloaded); and

issuing another request message from said client to said server for another response portion of said plurality of smaller response portions that has not been received at said client (Col. 4 lines 36-46: user continues to request portions of the file until the file is completely downloaded).

17. With respect to Claims 2 and 47, Bodin further teaches sending a reply message from said server to said client, said reply message having at least a portion of said first response portion (Col. 3 lines 49-51: portion is downloaded).

18. With respect to Claims 3 and 48, Bodin further teaches wherein said reply message further comprises an indication of a size of said response (Col. 3 lines 5-19 and Col. 4 lines 1-11).

19. With respect to Claims 4 and 49, Bodin further teaches wherein said indication of a size of said response further comprises an indication of how much of said response remains to be delivered to said client (Col. 4 lines 42-46: client is aware of the size of each portion and of which portions of the overall response remain to be downloaded).

20. Claims 13 and 14 describe the same functionality described in Claim 1 but for a second request for a second action. As such, Claims 13 and 14 are rejected based on the cited teachings and logic of the rejection of claim 1 and the fact that Bodin can repeat the same functions for multiple files (Col. 2 line 67 - Col. 3 line 4).

21. Claims 58 and 59 describe the same functionality described in Claim 46 but for a second request for a second action. As such, Claims 58 and 59 are rejected based on the cited teachings and logic of the rejection of claims 46 and 47 and the fact that Bodin can repeat the same functions for multiple files (Col. 2 line 67 - Col. 3 line 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

22. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

23. Claims 5, 9-12, 16, 21-24, 50 and 54-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin in view of RFC 969 "NETBLT: A Bulk Data Transfer Protocol" by Clark et al. (RFC969).

24. With respect to Claims 5 and 50, Bodin does not explicitly disclose said reply message is part of a burst of reply messages, said burst of reply messages carrying the complete content first response portion.

RFC969 teaches a protocol for transferring large quantities of data between computers. This includes breaking the data into portions (Page 2, section 3, paragraph 2: buffers) and further sending these portions in bursts of reply messages carrying the complete content of the portions (Page 4, section 4, paragraphs 8 and 9 of section 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method (and corresponding machine readable medium) disclosed by Bodin and modify it as indicated by RFC969 such that it further comprises said reply message is part of a burst of reply messages, said burst of reply messages carrying the complete content first response portion. One would be motivated to have this as it minimizes the overhead of network transmissions (In RFC969: Page 5, paragraph 2).

25. With respect to Claims 9 and 54, Bodin does not explicitly disclose said reply message further comprises an indication of a capacity of said server.

RFC969 teaches a protocol for transferring large quantities of data between computers. This includes breaking the data into portions (Page 2, section 3, paragraph 2: buffers) and further sending these portions in bursts of reply messages carrying the complete content of the portions (Page 4, section 4, paragraphs 8 and 9 of section 4). This includes messages with an indication of a capacity of said server (Page 5, burst size and rate as negotiated flow control parameters).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method (and corresponding machine readable medium) disclosed by Bodin and modify it as indicated by RFC969 such that it further comprises said reply message further comprises an indication of a capacity of said server. One would be motivated to have this as optimization of transmission parameters is depending on a machine's capabilities (In RFC969: Page 5, last 3 paragraphs).

26. With respect to Claims 10 and 55, Bodin further teaches wherein said indication of a capacity of said server further comprises a server burst size limit (In RFC969: Page 5 last 3 paragraphs).

27. With respect to Claims 11 and 56, Bodin does not explicitly disclose said reply message further comprises an indication of a capacity of said client.

RFC969 teaches a protocol for transferring large quantities of data between computers. This includes breaking the data into portions (Page 2, section 3, paragraph 2: buffers) and further sending these portions in bursts of reply messages carrying the complete content of the portions (Page 4, section 4, paragraphs 8 and 9 of section 4). This includes messages with an indication of a capacity of said client (Page 5, burst size and rate as negotiated flow control parameters).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method (and corresponding machine readable medium) disclosed by Bodin and modify it as indicated by RFC969 such that it further comprises said reply message further comprises an indication of a capacity of said client. One

would be motivated to have this as optimization of transmission parameters is depending on a machine's capabilities (In RFC969: Page 5, last 3 paragraphs).

28. With respect to Claims 12 and 57, Bodin further teaches wherein said indication of a capacity of said client further comprises a client burst size limit (In RFC969: Page 5 last 3 paragraphs).

29. With respect to Claim 16, Bodin teaches a method, comprising:

generating, at a client, a request for an action to a be performed by a server to a data object, said data object being maintained by said server, said server to generate a response for said client as a consequence of performing said action (Col. 2 line 65 - Col. 3 line 4: user selects a file to be downloaded from a server); and

performing the following at said client without regulating traffic flow by an underlying transport layer at said client (Bodin does not indicate an underlying transport layer in the following citations):

sending a request message from said client to said server over a network, said response being divide-able into a plurality of smaller response portions (Col. 3 lines 5-19: file to be downloaded is divided into a plurality of smaller portions), wherein said request message comprises a request for a first response portion of said plurality of smaller response portions wherein said first portion is less than the full size of said response and wherein said request message (Col. 3 lines 38-51: user can select a portion to request for download) further comprises:

1) a description of said action (Col. 3 line 38-51 and Col. 3 line 63-Col. 4 line 11 - server recognizes the request is for downloading a portion of a particular file);

2) a description of said data object (Col. 3 line 38-51 and Col. 3 line 63-Col. 4 line 11: portion name related to the file to be downloaded);

3) a first limit that defines the maximum size of said first portion (Col. 3 line 38-51 and Col. 3 line 63-Col. 4 line 11: portion size);

performing, at said server, at least a part of said action to said data object (Col. 3 lines 49-51).

Bodin does not explicitly disclose d) sending a burst of reply messages from said server to said client over said network in order to answer said request message, wherein: 1) each reply message within said burst of reply messages carries a different piece of said asked for first response portion; 2) the aggregate amount of response data of said different pieces of said burst of reply messages is an amount of data that is not larger than said first limit. RFC969 teaches a protocol for transferring large quantities of data between computers. This includes breaking the data into portions (Page 2, section 3, paragraph 2: buffers) and further sending these portions in bursts of reply messages carrying the complete content of the portions (Page 4, section 4, paragraphs 8 and 9 of section 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Bodin and modify it as indicated by RFC969 such that it further comprises sending a burst of reply messages from said server to said client over said network in order to answer said request message, wherein: 1) each reply message within said burst of reply messages carries a different piece of said asked for first response portion; 2) the aggregate amount of response data

of said different pieces of said burst of reply messages is an amount of data that is not larger than said first limit. One would be motivated to have this as optimization of transmission parameters is depending on a machine's capabilities (In RFC969: Page 5, last 3 paragraphs).

30. With respect to Claim 21, Bodin further teaches sending a second request message from said client to said server over said network, wherein said second request message asks for a second response portion of said plurality of smaller response portions (In Bodin: Col. 4 lines 39-46).

31. With respect to Claim 22, Bodin further teaches wherein said second request message further comprises sad first limit (In Bodin: Col. 3 line 63 - Col. 4 line 11: Portion size).

32. With respect to Claim 23, Bodin further teaches sending a second burst of reply messages from said server to said client in order to answer said second request message (In RFC969: Page 4, section 4, paragraphs 8 and 9 of section 4).

33. With respect to Claim 24, Bodin further teaches wherein said first limit is maintained by said client, and a third limit is maintained by said server, said third limit defining the maximum amount of data that said server is allowed to send to said client in answering said request message, wherein said third limit is less than said first limit and said aggregate of said different pieces is an amount of data that is not larger than said third limit (Page 5, negotiated flow control parameters).

34. With respect to Claim 25, Bodin further teaches wherein at least one of said reply message further comprises the size of said response (Col. 3 lines 5-19 and Col. 4 lines 1-11).

35. Claims 6-8 and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin in view of U.S. Patent 5,878,228 by Miller et al. (Miller).

36. With respect to Claims 6 and 51, Bodin does not explicitly disclose said another request message further comprises a starting address and an extent. Miller teaches a request message can include a starting address and an extent (Col. 6 lines 48-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method (and corresponding machine readable medium) disclosed by Bodin and modify it as indicated by Miller such that it further comprises said another request message further comprises a starting address and an extent. One would be motivated to have this as this allows particular portions of data to be requested which would be beneficial to the problem addressed by Bodin (In Bodin: Col.2 lines 6-10).

37. With respect to Claims 7 and 52, Bodin further teaches said starting address corresponds to an address between a starting address for said response and an ending address for said response (In Miller: Col. 6 lines 48-51).

38. With respect to Claims 8 and 53, Bodin further teaches said extent corresponds to an address between a starting address for said response and an ending address for said response (In Miller: Col. 6 lines 52-55).

39. Claims 17-19 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin in view of RFC969 and in further view of Miller.

40. With respect to Claim 17, Bodin does not explicitly disclose wherein said client and said server can identify said response as an addressable block of data. Miller teaches a client and a server can identify a response as and addressable block of data (Col. 6 lines 48-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method (and corresponding machine readable medium) disclosed by Bodin and modify it as indicated by Miller such that it further comprises said client and said server can identify said response as an addressable block of data. One would be motivated to have this as this allows particular portions of data to be requested which would be beneficial to the problem addressed by Bodin (In Bodin: Col.2 lines 6-10).

41. With respect to Claim 18, Bodin in view of RFC969 further teaches wherein said request further comprises 1) a first address of said block of data that corresponds to a starting address for said response (In Miller: Col. 6 lines 48-51); and 2) a second address of said block of data that corresponds to a terminating address for said response (In miller: Col. 6 lines 52-55).

42. With respect to Claim 19, Bodin in view of RFC969 further teaches wherein said request defines: 1) a first address of said block of data that corresponds to a starting address for said response (In Miller: Col. 6 lines 48-51); and 2) an extent value that describes how much information beyond said starting address corresponds to the rest of said response (In Miller Col. 6 lines 52-55).

43. With respect to Claim 27, Bodin in view of RFC969 does not explicitly disclose said client assigns a transaction identifier to said request and includes said transaction identifier into said request message. Miller teaches a client assigned transaction identifier for a request that is included in the request message (In Miller Col. 5 line 1-15 and Col. 6 lines 5-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Bodin in view of RFC969 and modify it as indicated by Miller such that it further comprises said client assigns a transaction identifier to said request and includes said transaction identifier into said request message. One would be motivated to have this as this allows particular portions of data to be associated with a particular transaction which would be beneficial to the problem addressed by Bodin (In Bodin: Col.2 lines 6-10).

44. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin in view of RFC969 and in further view of U.S. Patent 5,845,280 by Treadwell et al. (Treadwell).

45. With respect to Claim 26, Bodin in view of RFC969 does not explicitly disclose returning an object identifier that can be used for subsequent requests on the same object. However, Treadwell shows it is well known in the art that data objects can be assigned an object identifier (Col. 2 lines 25-29) that can be used in subsequent requests (Col. 7 lines 8-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Bodin in view of RFC969 and modify it as indicated by Treadwell such that at least one of said reply messages further comprises an object identifier that said client may use to refer to said data object for subsequent requests that invoke said data object. One would be motivated to have this as it reduces overhead in data transmission procedures (Col. 2 lines 29-35 of Treadwell).

Response to Arguments

46. Applicant's arguments filed 05/04/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

47. Applicant argues on pages 16 and 17 - "*The Present application, in contrast to the both the state of the prior art as discussed by Tanenbaum and the invention discussed by Bodin, discloses the inclusion of first portion size information at layer that is not supported by an underlying transport layer that performs traffic flow regulation, for example, by teaching inclusion of such first portion size information at the transport layer itself... The NETBLT reference, like the Bodin reference, fails to disclose the introduction of first portion size information at the transport layer*"

a. Examiner's response - In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claims. Specifically, applicant argues the present application "*discloses the inclusion of first portion size information* ***at layer that is not supported by an underlying transport layer that performs traffic flow regulation***" (emphasis added), the "*inclusion of such first portion size information* ***at the transport layer itself***" (emphasis added), and "*introduction of the first portion size information* ***at the transport layer***" (emphasis added). There are no limitations in the claims that indicate operations at a particular layer, such as the transport layer. The newly added limitation only indicates the operations are performed at a client "without regulating traffic flow by an underlying transport layer at said client".

b. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

48. Applicant argues on page 17 - "*Essentially, the newly presented claims recite the execution of the claimed processes where an underlying transport layer that regulates traffic flow is not employed. This stands in contrast to the state of the prior art at the time the application was filed where similar processes (such as prior art file transfers and the Bodin reference) only comprehend the use of an underlying transport layer that regulates traffic flow.*"

c. Examiner's response - As noted by the 112 rejections presented in this office action, it is unclear what applicant is attempting to claim as the

specification clearly states the use of an underlying transport layer in controlling the flow of information between applications (page 12 of applicant's specification). Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Conclusion

49. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lazaro whose telephone number is 571-272-3986. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David Lazaro
July 16, 2007

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER